



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tung des Bildes an: "Die Hauptperson des Bildes, der gegenüber die Krieger den späteren Geschlechtern als Kinder erscheinen konnten, war in sehr satten Farben gemalt, was den Anlass dazu gab, später das bunte Gewand des Pfeifers immer stark zu betonen. Ob diese Hauptperson den Anführer darstellte oder einen Spielmann, lässt sich nicht entscheiden."

"Im Jahre 1540 wurde Hameln protestantisch, die Seelenmessen hörten auf. Um das Bild wob die Sage ihre Fäden, aber dass es einen "exitus" aus dem Ostthore im Jahre 1259 darstelle, mit dem ein grosses Unglück verbunden sei, das hielt man fest. Die Volksdeutung des Bildes in der Stadt dringt nach auswärts, wird dort mit einer Malektionsgeschichte unter dem Einflusse einer Tänzersage verbunden, dann nachweislich zuerst von Joh. Weier (1576) schriftlich fixiert und verbreitet sich so in bestimmter Fassung mit seinem Werke in deutschen wie in fremden Landen."

"Unter dessen war in Hameln bereits an der Sage ein lebhaftes Interesse erwacht. Man verewigte sie im Jahre 1556 in einer Inschrift am Neuthor, in welcher der Zauberer als 'magus,' noch nicht als 'tibicen' bezeichnet wird."

Die Eintragung in ein altes Passional sowie in Urkunden des 14. Jahrhunderts erklärt Jostes für Fälschungen.

Da nun die Sage sich erst nach dem Jahre 1540, d. h. nach dem Aufhören der Seelenmessen, an das Bild zu Hameln knüpfen konnte, so können wir die Quelle des Liedes "Der Rattenfänger von Hameln," *Wunderhorn*, Bd. I, nicht vor dieser Zeit suchen. Von den uns bekannten dichterischen Aufzeichnungen der Sage ist die Reimchronik die älteste. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass Rollenhagen, dessen Werk erst im Jahre 1595 gedruckt wurde, aus der Reimchronik schöpfte, die im Jahre 1589 erschien. Möglicherweise mag er ein Volkslied gekannt haben, welches dann auch Backhaus in die Reimchronik aufgenommen haben muss.

Das Rattenfängerlied im *Wunderhorn*, Bd. I, zeigt grössere Ähnlichkeit mit der Fassung der Reimchronik als mit derjenigen des *Froschmeuslers*, vgl. besonders Str. 8, Z. 2, 3 des Gedichtes im *Wunderhorn* mit den entsprechenden Zeilen der anderen Fassungen. Man muss daher annehmen, der Abschreiber des Wunderhornliedes

habe die Reimchronik benutzt und das Lied dann zugestutzt, oder aber er habe sich eines Fliegenden Blattes bedient, das entweder die Vorlage für die Fassung der Reimchronik war oder auf der Reimchronik fusste.

GERTRUD C. SCHMIDT.

Bryn Mawr College.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

El Diablo Cojuelo por Luis Vélez de Guevara. Reproducción de la edición príncipe de Madrid, 1641, por ADOLFO BONILLA Y SAN MARTÍN. Vigo: Librería de Eugenio Krapf, 1902.

El Libro de Patronio ó El Conde Lucanor, compuesto por el Príncipe don JUAN MANUEL en los años de 1328-1329. Reproducido conforme al texto del códice del Conde Puñonrostro. Segunda edición reformada. Vigo: Librería de Eugenio Krapf, 1902.

Beautiful specimens of the typographer's art are both these books. Printed on excellent paper, wide of margin and with clear type, they even surpass the same publisher's edition of the *Celestina*, noted in these columns some time ago.

The lack of a good edition of *El Diablo Cojuelo* has been long deplored. A comparison of the most available imprints of it with the first edition of 1641, made in the Seminary of Professor Baist years ago, showed how poor the current versions were. Señor Bonilla has done a good service to students of Spanish Literature in editing this new edition, and he has brought to his task the sound scholarship for which he is well known. He has given us an almost exact reproduction of the princeps of 1641, correcting obvious errors (which are noted at the foot of the page) and dividing the work into paragraphs for convenience of reading. To the end of the volume is subjoined an explanation of difficult phrases and words. These notes, which are a precious addition to the work, show the editor's wide and accurate reading. Sr. Bonilla says: "We have tried to err rather on the side of giving too much than giving too little," yet there are a number of passages remain-

ing in the text, which are not entirely clear—at least not to the writer—and upon which no comment is found. (In *mas ruido que la Bermuda*, the latter word is certainly = the Bermudas; for *velicomen* see *Romania*, Vol. 29, p. 375, 'del aleman *wilkommenbecher*', according to Menéndez Pidal. It is rather simply the German *wilkommen*, 'a drinking cup'). But the editor has cleared up a number of obscure passages and allusions and thrown some light on many others. *El Diablo Cojuelo* is by no means easy to read and we only wish Sr. Bonilla had erred a little more on the side of liberality. In his commentary he was aided somewhat by the notes that had been written by Sr. Duran at the request of the Spanish Academy in 1851, on account of 'certain doubts' possessed by one Piatnitzki, who was about to translate *El Diablo Cojuelo* into Russian. Sr. Duran, after completing his task as best he could, desired that others should put *la última mano* to the work, and a commission was appointed, which found nothing to add to what he had done, but which recommended "that the government (through which Piatnitzki's request had come) be advised how convenient it would be not to distract the Academy from its important labors by queries of this kind, which, in the present case, shewed a lamentable ignorance of the Castilian tongue," etc.

Piatnitzki's ignorance, however, is rather a matter for rejoicing, since it prompted Sr. Duran to give us of his great store of knowledge, of which Sr. Bonilla has here availed himself, although most sparingly, it must be confessed.

Among the questions discussed by the editor is: When was *El Diablo Cojuelo* written? He concludes, after weighing the evidence carefully, that it was surely finished before April, 1639. There is evidence to show that the seventh *tranco* was written between 1630 and 1631, but facts are also adduced proving that it could not have been finished till 1637, in which year a *certamen* was held at Madrid, of which Luis Vélez was president and in which he read a sonnet which he afterwards inserted in the ninth *tranco*. This *vejamen* is certainly of the greatest interest for the study of the origin of *El Diablo Cojuelo*. The *oración* which Luis Vélez held on that occasion and which he likewise introduced into his novel

(tenth *tranco*), has been preserved among the manuscripts of the Biblioteca Nacional, and is given by Sr. Serrano y Sanz in the appendix to the edition of Sr. Bonilla, together with the *vejamen* read by D. Francisco de Rojas Zorilla in the Buen Retiro on February 21, 1637, from which *vejamen* of his friend Rojas the argument of Vélez's novel may have been taken, as the editor conjectures.¹ Sr. Bonilla also examines the relation of *El Diablo Cojuelo* to the *sueños* of Quevedo and other works, all of which is of exceeding interest, and concludes with a discussion of the adaptation by Le Sage (*Le Diable boiteux*), and the re-translation of this into Spanish, and the editor notes that there are Spanish editions of *Le Diable boiteux* which ascribe the text to Vélez de Guevara. It is, therefore, in part at least, with the object of rehabilitating Luis Vélez as the author of *El Diablo Cojuelo* that Sr. Bonilla issues his edition of this masterpiece.

Some additional notes to *El Diablo Cojuelo* have since been published in the 'Revista de Archivos' (April and May, 1902, p. 382). The attempt is there made to explain the phrase *Mula de Liñan*. Sr. Bonilla had conjectured, in his Spanish translation of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *History of Spanish Literature*, that the author of Avelaneda's continuation of *Don Quixote* is really Pedro Liñan de Riaza. Whatever may be said of the other attempts that have been made to identify the real author of this excellent continuation, which only falls short of the original—this one certainly does not lack probability. Liñan was one of the rare wits of his time and a great friend of Lope de Vega, who had somewhat of a score to settle with Cervantes. And, although what Sr. Bonilla adduces in support of his hypothesis does not much strengthen it, yet, as he says: *En materia de hipótesis lícito es á qualquier cristiano hacer de su capa un sayo, como no salga de los linderos de lo razonable*.

For the other work noted at the head of this article,—the still more famous *Conde Lucanor* of Don Juan Manuel, we should feel no less grateful. Here Sr. Krapf, the printer of the work,

¹ Some of these documents had been previously published by Morel-Fatio, in his *L'Espagne au xvi^e et au xvi^e siècles*, pp. 614-620.

assumes also the rôle of editor, and he has acquitted himself of his nowise easy task in a manner most creditable. In the *Advertencia* he gives a very clear and succinct account of the various manuscripts of the *Conde Lucanor*, five in number, and also of the various editions that have appeared *hasta la fecha*.

The first printed edition, that of Argote de Molina (Sevilla, Hernando Diaz, 1575), of which I possess a copy, has been designated by Ticknor as "one of the rarest books in the world." The second, Madrid, 1642, is also of great rarity. The *princeps* of Argote de Molina was reprinted by Adalbert Keller at Leipzig, in 1839, but omitting both the preliminary and the supplementary matter. Gayangos next published it in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, taking as the basis of his text the Codex Gayangos (now in the Bibl. Nacional), but treating the text in a very arbitrary manner. Finally, four years ago (Leipzig, 1900) the lamented Hermann Knust, a scholar who had done so much for the history of early Spanish literature, resolved to publish a critical edition, which he did not live to finish, and which was issued after his death by A. Birch-Hirschfeld. In 1898 Sr. Krapf had published an edition of the *Conde Lucanor*, which, however, I have never seen, and now he publishes this new edition with all the excellence and skill in typography, for which his name is now so well known.

Since the appearance of the edition of 1898, the editor tells us, he has acquired possession of the manuscript formerly belonging to the Conde de Puñonrostro, one of the most valuable of all the codices of Don Juan Manuel, and which contains, besides the *Conde Lucanor*, several other important works, among which is the *Libro de los Assayamientos et Engaños de los Mugerres*, which was published, 'pero malisimamente,' by Comparetti in 1869 in his *Ricerca intorno al libro di Sindibad*, a book which has become very scarce. We hope Sr. Krapf may find an opportunity of publishing also this important text.

The editor describes in detail the *Códice Puñonrostro*, which seems to have suffered considerably at the beginning, and also shows lacunæ in various places. Nevertheless, while all the other manuscripts contain but fifty-one tales, this codex contains fifty-four.

Of the edition published by Sr. Krapf, he says: *Este trabajo es exclusivamente mio, sin que nadie intervenga en él.*

Both these publications of Sr. Krapf are excellent and deserve the warm encouragement of all students of Spanish.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

R. MENÉNDEZ PIDAL: *La leyenda del Abad Don Juan de Montemayor* (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, Band II), Dresden, 1903.

In this work the author of the *Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara* has given further proof of his skill in investigating the epic tradition of his native land. Ripe scholarship, patient industry, and the application of sane principles of editorship are characteristic of this present volume as they are of all the other works of the energetic young professor of the University of Madrid.

The earliest mention now to be found of the legend of the Abbot John of Montemayor is of the fourteenth century and occurs in the introduction of the lost poem of the Portuguese Alfonso Giraldes on the battle of Salado (1340). In the seventeenth century the work of Giraldes was still known to Jorge Cardoso, who in his *Agiologio lusitano* (1652) quotes these verses of it:

Outros falan da gran rason
De Bistoris gram sabedor,
E do Abbade Dom Ioon
Que venceo Rei Almançor.

In her article on Portuguese literature in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (II, ii, 206), C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos judged that Giraldes referred to a Portuguese poem on the Abbot John, but Menéndez Pidal thinks this doubtful, and he here proceeds to point out evident signs of a Castilian (Leonese) origin and of Castilian (Leonese) inspiration in the legend.

After the rather casual mention of the Abbot by Giraldes, no trace of the legend is to be found in Portugal until at a relatively late date it is taken up by learned writers. On the other hand,